

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested based on the Amendments to the claims and the following remarks. The amendments to the specification and the claims add no new matter.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 14-20 are new. Claims 1, 2, 14, 15 and 20 are the independent claims.

Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

### **Drawing Objection**

The specification has been corrected to identify Fig. 3b, instead of Fig. 3c, which was incorrectly listed in the Brief Description of the Drawings Section. Figure 3b is a submitted drawing. This amendment is believed to overcome the objection and the withdrawal of the objection is formally requested.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 7 and 9-11 contain allowable subject matter.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-6, 8, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Temburg (U.S. 5,031,279). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 defines a “device on a spinning preparatory machine . . . wherein the separating blade is arranged on a support which is displaceable substantially parallel to the periphery of the roller for adjusting the distance between the separating blade and the fixed-position counter-element.” This claimed movement is shown in Figs. 3a and 3b, where the width of opening 21 between the separating blade 17’ and the feed roller 1 is adjusted. The separating blade 17’ is arranged on a support 20a and is displaced along the periphery of roller 3a. This movement is *substantially parallel* to the surface of the roller as indicated by arrows C and D shown in Figs. 3a and 3b. The movement of arrows C and D is parallel to the outer surface of the licker-in or roller 3a. This movement is concentric with center point M of licker-in or roller 3a. It is noted that the distance from the separating blade to the center of licker-in or roller 3a remains substantially constant as the distance between the feed roller 1 and the separating blade 17’ is adjusted, see the sentence bridging pages 9 and 10 of the disclosure.

This movement is in contrast to that described by Temburg. Temburg *does not teach* or suggest that the movement of the mote knife 7 arranged on the carrier element 5 is displaceable substantially parallel to the periphery of roller 3. See footnote<sup>1</sup>. Referring to figure 3, Temburg discloses a system where a mote knife 7 is arranged on a carrier element 5. Temburg teaches that

---

<sup>1</sup> In the section cited by the Examiner (column 3, lines 25-34), there is an error in the patent. Applicant believes the phrase “guide element 5” at column 3, lines 30 and 32 should be “carrier element 5.” The guide element is discussed in the preceding lines, see column 3, lines 18-25. See also claim 5.

the carrier element 5 has two securing screws 38 and 39 to fasten the carrier (guide) element 5 to the cleaning machine. By loosening the screws, the carrier (guide) element 5 may be radially adjusted relative to the fiber processing roller. The radial movement is to adjust the distance of the radius between the carrier element 5 and the center of roller 3, as described in claim 5, column 4, lines 64-68.

An important difference between the claimed invention and the Temburg reference is the direction of the movement of the claimed support and separating blade. In the claimed invention, the direction of these components is *substantially parallel to the periphery* of the roller, whereas in the Temburg reference the movement adjusts the radial distance *perpendicular to the periphery* of the roller. Nowhere in the Temburg reference is the carrier element 5 adjusted substantially parallel to the periphery of roller 3 as recited in the claim. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Temburg since the direction of movement of the support in the claim is different from the movement of the carrier element as disclosed.

Claim 1 further states “the extraction chamber co-operates with a guide element, the guide element being arranged to be in a fixed position during operation of the machine and being able to guide separated impurities and/or air into the opening of the extraction chamber.” The guide element is depicted in Figs. 3a and 3b as numeral 19a. The guide element 19a is used to define the air-inlet separation ‘a’ 38 between feed roller 1 and the rounded portion of the guide element 19a. This distance is constant during operation of the system, and can be adjusted when the system is not in operation. The guide member 19a moves relative to the extraction chamber

18a, as seen in figure 3a and 3b. This allows the size of separation opening 21 between the feed roller 1 and the separating blade 7a to be adjusted while maintaining a constant opening size for the air-inlet 38. An advantage of this function of the guide element is that separated impurities land on the guide element and are reliable guided into the extraction chamber 18a regardless of the size of opening 21, see paragraph bridging pages 11 and 12 of the disclosure.

Temburg shows guide elements in Figs. 1-6. In Fig. 2, the guide element 23 is mounted on a carrier element 22. The function of the guide element 23 is to define the separation opening 24 between the carrier element 22 and the mote knife 7. The mote knife 7 is circumferentially spaced from the guide element 23 and defines an aperture that constitutes a waste removal opening 24, see column 2, line 60-column 3, line 4.

The guide element of the claimed invention has a different purpose than the guide element of Temburg. Temburg *does not teach* that the “extraction chamber co-operates with a guide element” as recited in claim 1. The guide element 23 of Temburg co-operates with the mote knife 7 to define an aperture of a waste removal opening 24. Temburg does not disclose any relationship between guide element 23 and suction chamber 9, as recited in claim 1.

A further difference between the claimed invention and Temburg is the mechanism to guide impurities into the extraction chamber. Temburg *does not teach* that the “the guide element is used to guide the impurities and/or air into the extraction chamber” as recited in claim 1. Temburg discloses a suction chamber 9 attached to the carrier element 5 in figure 2. The guide element 23 is used to define the opening between the carrier element 22 and the mote knife

7a. The system of Temburg uses a suction source attached to the suction chamber 9 to guide impurities into the suction chamber, see column 2, lines 57-59. It is the suction source, not the guide element of Temburg that is responsible for guiding impurities into the suction chamber 9. Therefore Temburg does not disclose using the guide element to guide impurities and/or air into the extraction chamber as claimed.

Claims 2, 14, 15 and 20 recite similar subject matter and are in condition for allowance for reasons analogous to claim 1. Claims 3-13 and 16-19 depend from claims 2 and 15 respectively and are therefore also considered to be in condition for allowance.

## Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided. The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 6, 2004

  
Edward W. Yee  
Registration No. 47,294  
VENABLE  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998  
Telephone: (202) 962-4800  
Telefax: (202) 962-8300

DC2-DOCS1-556972